arXiv:hep-ph/0312098v1 7 Dec 2003

Single and double see-saw for quark-lepton and neutrino masses

Biswajoy Brahmachari

Department of Physics, Vidyasagar Evening College
39, Sankar Ghosh Lane, Kolkata 700006, India.

Abstract

A left-right model of quarks and leptons based on the gauge group $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ is studied. Here the scalar sector consists of only two doublets namely (1,2,1,1) and (1,1,2,1) but familiar bidoublet (1,2,2,0) is removed. Quarks and charged leptons get mass from a single see-saw mechanism but neutrinos get mass by a double see-saw mechanism. In this type of models the heaviest right handed neutrino can be of the order of 10^{13} GeVs or less in a natural way, depending on the size of related Yukawa couplings.

VEC/PHYSICS/P/1/2003-2004

When the particle content of the standard model is extended by including right handed gauge bosons [1], the gauge group becomes $\mathcal{G}_{LR} \equiv SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$, and a linear combination of diagonal generators lead to conserved electric charge at low energy. The relationship is

$$Q = T_{3L} + T_{3R} + \frac{(B-L)}{2} = T_{3L} + \frac{Y}{2}. \tag{1}$$

Quarks and leptons transform under G_{LR}. It is not always easy to embed low energy quarks and leptons in representations of larger gauge groups. But for the left-right symmetric case, G_{LR} posesses natural representations to embed the quarks and leptons of the standard model.

$$\begin{aligned} q_L = (u,d)_L &\sim (3,2,1,1/3), && (2)\\ q_R = (u,d)_R &\sim (3,1,2,1/3), && (3)\\ l_L = (\nu,e)_L &\sim (1,2,1,-1), && (4)\\ l_R = (N,e)_R &\sim (1,1,2,-1), && (5)\end{aligned}$$

where a new fermion, i.e. N_R, has been added to fill the gap in l_R doublet. This is just the right handed neutrino. For three generations, there are three of them. The lightest mass eigenstate of this right handed triplet may decay violating CP (Charge conjugation times Parity), to produce a tiny lepton asymmetry in early universe[7].

In previous left-right models[1], a scalar bidoublet transforming as $(1,2,2,0)$ was included because then we get correct Yukawa couplings at the tree level leading to fermion masses. It is a natural choice if we want the quarks and leptons to have tree-level masses. But fermion mass problem seems to be a much more involved one. Fermions may not have got masses at the tree level at all. Instead they may have got masses from higher dimensional operators. The details of such high scale physics could be so obscure to us at the moment, that one may have to resort to effective non-renormalizable operators of mass dimension more than four.

Suppose however that we are only interested in the spontaneous breaking of $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ to $U(1)_{em}$ with $v_R >> v_L$, then the simplest way is to introduce two Higgs doublets transforming as

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_L = (\phi_L^+, \phi_L^0) &\sim (1,2,1,1), && (6)\\ \Phi_R = (\phi_R^+, \phi_R^0) &\sim (1,1,2,1). && (7)\end{aligned}$$

---

[1] See Ref[3] for models without (1,2,2,0)

Suppose we now do not admit any other scalar multiplet [2]. This situation can be compared with to the situation in the standard model, where $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ is spontaneously broken down to $U(1)_{em}$ by a Higgs doublet and we do not admit anything else in the scalar sector. In that case, we find that quark and charged-lepton masses are generated at tree level, but neutrinos obtain Majorana masses only through the dimension-five operator[2]. In our case, in the absence of the bidoublet, all fermion masses, have their origin in some kind of see-saw mechanism[3], as shown below. Using Eqs. (2) to (7), it is clear that the following two objects

$$\begin{aligned}(l_L\Phi_L) &= \nu_L\phi_L^0 - e_L\phi_L^+, & (8)\\ (l_R\Phi_R) &= N_R\phi_R^0 - e_R\phi_R^+, & (9)\end{aligned}$$

are invariants under $\mathcal{G}_{LR}$. Hence we have the dimension-five operators given by

$$\mathcal{L}_M = \frac{f_{ij}^L}{2\Lambda_M}(l_{iL}\Phi_L)(l_{jL}\Phi_L) + \frac{f_{ij}^R}{2\Lambda_M}(l_{iR}\Phi_R)(l_{jR}\Phi_R) + H.c., \tag{10}$$

which will generate Majorana neutrino masses proportional to v_L^2/Λ_M for ν_L and v_R^2/Λ_M for N_R. In addition, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_D = \frac{f_{ij}^D}{\Lambda_D}(\bar{l}_{iL}\Phi_L^*)(l_{jR}\Phi_R) + H.c., \tag{11}$$

and the corresponding dimension-five operators which will generate Dirac masses for all the quarks and charged leptons. Therefore the combination $(\Phi_L^*\Phi_R)$ behaves as an effective (1,2,2,0) scalar [5] eventhough we have forbidden (1,2,2,0) in our Higgs choice.

Because in left-right symmetric models, both left handed as well as right handed projections of neutrino is available at our disposal, they can pair up and, from Eq. (11) we get the Dirac type mass of neutrino as,

$$(m_D)_{ij} = \frac{f_{ij}^D v_L v_R}{\Lambda_D}, \tag{12}$$

hence ν_L gets a double seesaw Majorana [6] mass of order

$$\frac{m_D^2}{m_N} \sim \frac{v_L^2 v_R^2}{\Lambda_D^2}\frac{\Lambda_M}{v_R^2} = \frac{v_L^2\Lambda_M}{\Lambda_D^2}, \tag{13}$$

---

[2] This Higgs choice was made previously by Babu and Mohapatra[3] in the context of the strong CP problem

[3] A summary of various mechanisms to obtain neutrino mass can be found in Ref. [4]

v_L/GeV	Λ_M/GeV	Λ_D/GeV	m_ν/eV
100	10^{19}	10^{16}	1
100	10^{18}	10^{16}	0.1
100	10^{18}	2×10^{16}	0.025
91	10^{18}	2×10^{16}	0.0207

Table 1: Magnitudes of neutrino masses generated via double seesaw

where in Eq. (13) we have used the usual single seesaw formula

$$M_{light} = M_L + m_{Dirac}^T \frac{1}{M_R} m_{Dirac}. \tag{14}$$

Note that $\frac{m_D^2}{m_N}$ is much larger than $v_L^2/\Lambda_M \equiv M_L$ if $\Lambda_D << \Lambda_M$. Take for example Λ_M to be the Planck scale of 10^{19} GeV and Λ_D to be the grand-unification scale of 10^{16} GeV, then the neutrino mass scale is 1 eV for v_L of order 100 GeV. We can also see that $M_L \sim 10^{-6}$ eV can be safely neglected. These masses are tabulated in Table 1. The difference between Λ_M and Λ_D may be due to the fact that if we assign a global fermion number F to l_L and l_R, then $\mathcal{L}_M$ has $F = \pm 2$ but $\mathcal{L}_D$ has $F = 0$.

Since the Dirac masses of quarks and charged leptons are also given by Eq. (12), v_R cannot be much below Λ_D. This means that $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ is broken at a very high scale to $U(1)_Y$, and our model at low energy is just the standard model. We do however have the extra right handed neutrinos N_R with masses of order v_R^2/Λ_M, i.e. below 10^{13} GeV, which are useful for leptogenesis, as is well-known.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Prof. R.N. Mohapatra for communications

References

[1] J. C. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. **D10**, 275 (1974); R. N. Mohapatra and J. C. Pati, Phys. Rev. **D11**, 566, 2558 (1975); G. Senjanovic and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. **D12**, 1502 (1975); G. Senjanovic, Nucl.

Phys. **B153**, 334 (1979); B. Brahmachari, U. Sarkar, K. Sridhar. Phys. Lett. **B297** 105 (1992); N.G. Deshpande, E. Keith, Palash B. Pal, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 2261 (1993).

[2] S. Wienberg, Phys. Rev. Lett **43**, 1566 (1979); M. Gell-Mann, P. Rammond and R. Slansky, in Supergravity, eds D. Freedman et al, North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam 1980; T. Yanagida, in proceedings of the KEK workshop, 1979 (Unpublished); R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).

[3] K. S. babu and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 1079 (1989); Phys. Rev. **D 41**, 1286 (1990).

[4] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1171 (1998)

[5] B. Brahmachari, E. Ma, U. Sarkar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 011801 (2003)

[6] See for example M. Bastero-Gil and B. Brahmachari, Nucl. Phys. **B482**, 39 (1996); I. S. Sogami, H. Tanaka, and T. Shinohara, Prog. Theor. Phys. **101**, 707 (1999).

[7] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **174B**, 45 (1986); M. Flanz, E. A. Paschos, and U. Sarkar, Phys. Lett. **B345**, 248 (1995); Erratum: **B382**, 447 (1996); M. Flanz, E. A. Paschos, U. Sarkar, and J. Weiss, Phys. Lett. **B389**, 693 (1996); W. Buchmuller and M. Plumacher, Phys. Lett. **B389**, 73 (1996); **B431**, 354 (1998); E. Roulet, L. Covi, and F. Vissani, Phys. Lett. **B424**, 101 (1998); M. S. Berger, B. Brahmachari, Phys.Rev. **D60**, 073009 (1999); T. Hambye, E. Ma, M. Raidal, and U. Sarkar, Phys. Lett. **B512**, 373 (2001).